

Serial No. 09/930,720
Amdt. dated November 18, 2005
Reply to Office Action of August 18, 2005

Attorney Docket No. CAS0048

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 32 through 40 and 48 through 62 remain in this application. Claims 41 through 47 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Also, claims 32, 48, 51, 54, 61 and 62 are amended.

Claims 32 through 40 and 48 through 62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,317,684 B1 to Roeseler, et al. ("Roeseler, et al. patent").

Claim 32 provides, *inter alia*, receiving a route-identifier from a user interface, wherein the route-identifier identifies a route between the first location and the second location. Claim 48 provides, *inter alia*, computer readable program code that receives a route-identifier from a user interface, wherein the route-identifier identifies a relationship between the first location and the second location. Claim 54 provides, *inter alia*, receiving a route-identifier from a user interface.

The above Office Action states that receiving a route-identifier from a user interface is described at col. 4, lines 49 and 50, of the Roeseler, et al. patent, where it states "[i]n this instance, the caller's route may be permanently stored under the caller's ID number, etc." However, similar to the Hayashi, et al. patent discussed previously, the "caller's ID number" in Roeseler, et al. patent is a transaction identifier assigned by the route calculation server. As described at col. 3, line 64, through col. 4, line 4, of the Roeseler, et al. patent, each terminal is assigned an identifier that is associated with the terminal and is not particularly provided by a user interface. On the other hand, claims 32, 48 and 54 provide a route-identifier that is a "label"

Serial No. 09/930,720
Amdt. dated November 18, 2005
Reply to Office Action of August 18, 2005

Attorney Docket No. CAS0048

received from the user via a user interface (for example "HOME/WORK"; see page 4, lines 9 through 13). Thus, claims 32, 48 and 54, as submitted by Applicant's amendment of July 11, 2005, distinguish patentably from the Roeseler, et al. patent.

It should be noted that, upon thorough review of the Roeseler, et al. patent, Applicant has discovered that this patent describes retrieval of a stored route in response to providing a route ID at a user interface. In particular, col. 6, lines 17 through 22; and col. 8, lines 49 through 51, describe retrieval of a stored route when a caller inputs a route ID via audio or touch tone (DTMF). In contrast, claims 32, 48 and 54 provide using a user interface to identify a route-identifier for *storing* route information, not retrieving a stored route as described by the Roeseler, et al. patent, and claims 32, 48 and 54 are hereby amended to further emphasize this distinction from the Roeseler, et al. patent. Therefore, claims 32, 48 and 54 as amended distinguish patentably from the Roeseler, et al.

Claims 33 through 40, 49 through 53, and 55 through 62 depend from and include all limitations of independent claims 32, 48 and 54. Therefore, claims 33 through 40, 49 through 53, and 55 through 62 distinguish patentably from the Roeseler, et al. patent for the reasons stated above for claims 32, 48 and 54.

In view of the above, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §102(e) rejection of claims 32 through 40 and 48 through 62 are respectfully requested.

Serial No. 09/930,720
Amdt. dated November 18, 2005
Reply to Office Action of August 18, 2005

Attorney Docket No. CAS0048

CONCLUSION

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein. Also, no amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicant has argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to deduct any additional fees arising as a result of this response, including any fees for Extensions of Time, or any other communication from or to credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 50-2117.

It is submitted that the claims clearly define the invention, are supported by the specification and drawings, and are in a condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. Should the Examiner have any questions or concerns that may expedite prosecution of the present application, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,
Balasuriya, Senaka

Please forward all correspondence to:
Motorola, Inc.
Law Department (HDW)
600 North US Highway 45, AS437
Libertyville, IL 60048



Hisashi D. Watanabe
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 37,465
Telephone: (847) 523-2322
Facsimile: (847) 523-2350

11/18/05
Date